Putin's 2013 "80% of Bolsheviks Were Jews" Remark: Why It Can Trigger Criminal Speech Laws in Many Countries, But Not in Kansas

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

December 27, 2025

This paper stays with the text and the law. It does not adjudicate whether the statement is true or false. The focal object is a single remark published on June 13, 2013 in the Kremlin's record of President Vladimir Putin's visit to Moscow's Jewish Museum and Tolerance Center. In that transcript, Putin says: "The decision to nationalise this library was made by the first Soviet government, whose composition was 80–85% Jewish." The phrasing often gets paraphrased online as "80% of Bolsheviks were Jews," but the paper treats the Kremlin transcript sentence as the governing text. The question is jurisdictional: how can the same sentence produce radically different legal exposure depending on where it is said, re-posted, or broadcast? In many countries, criminal speech law contains offenses aimed at inciting hatred or discrimination against protected groups, humiliating a group's dignity, or provoking public disorder through group-targeted vilification. Under those legal architectures, repeating or amplifying a sentence that assigns collective institutional agency to a protected group can become prosecutable if statutory elements are satisfied (publicity, intent, likelihood, and contextual meaning). Kansas, by contrast, sits inside the U.S. First Amendment baseline: there is no general "hate speech" crime, and punishment typically requires narrow, well-defined categories such as incitement to imminent lawless action or true threats. The result is a clean comparative lesson: one text, many legal regimes, sharply different outcomes.

Keywords: Putin 2013, Jewish Museum and Tolerance Center, first Soviet government, protected group speech, incitement to hatred, group defamation, group insult, public order offences, Germany StGB Section 130, France Press Law 1881 Article 24, UK Public Order Act 1986 Section 18, Canada Criminal Code Section 319, Russia Criminal Code Article 282, EU Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA, First Amendment, Brandenburg v. Ohio, R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul, Kansas Constitution Bill of Rights Section 11.

A collaboration with GPT-5.2-Thinking. 40 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. The Text: What Was Said and What Counts as the “Remark”
1.1 The Kremlin transcript sentence as the authoritative wording
1.2 Common paraphrases vs the governing text (“Bolsheviks” vs “first Soviet government”)
1.3 Why precision matters legally: elements attach to what is communicated, not what was “meant”

2. What “Can Trigger Criminal Speech Laws” Means
2.1 No “banned sentence” theory: element-based criminal offenses
2.2 Public vs private thresholds (publication, meeting, broadcast, online distribution)
2.3 Three recurring offense families: incitement, group insult/defamation, public-order/extremism

3. Germany: Incitement to Hatred and Group-Dignity Protection
3.1 StGB Section 130 as a public-peace and dignity-protection statute
3.2 The “incites hatred / calls for measures” pathway vs the “insults/defames segments” pathway
3.3 Why context does the work: when an attribution becomes “malicious maligning” in practice

4. France: Press-Offence Structure and Group-Targeted Provocation
4.1 The 1881 Press Law model: speech is “free,” but “abuses” are offenses
4.2 Article 24-style provocation: incitement to hatred/violence/discrimination on protected grounds
4.3 Group defamation and group insult concepts as separate hooks
4.4 The operative question for this text: attribution as provocation vs attribution as defamation/insult

5. United Kingdom: “Stirring Up Racial Hatred” Offenses
5.1 Public Order Act 1986 Section 18: “threatening, abusive or insulting” words and intent/likelihood
5.2 The proof structure: intent to stir up hatred vs hatred likely to be stirred up
5.3 Practical exposure for repetition: quotation, endorsement, and dissemination problems

6. Canada: Hate-Propaganda Crimes and the Public Conversation Line
6.1 Section 319(1): public incitement of hatred plus breach-of-the-peace likelihood
6.2 Section 319(2): wilful promotion of hatred outside private conversation
6.3 How prosecutors map “group agency” narratives into statutory elements

7. Russia: Incitement of Hatred/Enmity and Humiliation of Human Dignity
7.1 Criminal Code Article 282: “incitement” and “abasement of dignity” on protected grounds

7.2 Public/media dissemination as a trigger condition
7.3 Enforcement discretion as a legal fact: why text alone does not predict outcomes reliably

8. The “Many Countries” Mechanism: EU Baseline Harmonization
8.1 Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA as an EU-wide floor for criminalization of racist/xenophobic expression
8.2 Why harmonization increases cross-border exposure for a single sentence
8.3 National variation: the same floor, different ceilings, defenses, and case-law cultures

9. Why Not in Kansas: The U.S. Constitutional Baseline
9.1 First Amendment: no general prohibition on offensive group-directed political speech
9.2 Brandenburg: incitement requires intent + imminence + likelihood
9.3 R.A.V.: viewpoint-selective bans are constitutionally disfavored
9.4 Kansas Bill of Rights Section 11: broad liberty with “abuse” handled through narrow doctrines
9.5 The Kansas boundary conditions: true threats, targeted harassment, and related exceptions

10. Publication Reality: One Sentence, Many Jurisdictions
10.1 Where the audience is can matter as much as where the speaker is
10.2 Criminal exposure vs platform enforcement: separate systems, compounding effects
10.3 A practical rule for cross-border speech: map elements before amplifying controversial attributions

11. Conclusion
11.1 Restatement: the text can “trigger” liability abroad but remains broadly protected in Kansas
11.2 The comparative payoff: fewer myths about “banned words,” more clarity about legal elements
11.3 Closing charge: treat jurisdiction as a first-class parameter whenever you quote and distribute

References

Art

1. The Text: What Was Said and What Counts as the "Remark"

This paper begins by treating the "remark" as a legal object: a fixed sequence of words, spoken by a public official, preserved in an official transcript, and later repeated by others across jurisdictions. The point is not to decide whether the remark is historically accurate. The point is to identify what text is actually being circulated, what variants are being circulated instead, and why those differences matter when a prosecutor (or a court, or a platform compliance team) asks: "What exactly did the speaker communicate to the public?"

Two practical realities shape everything that follows. First, speech-law systems do not usually punish "ideas in the air"; they evaluate utterances in a public setting, with identifiable addressees, foreseeable effects, and specific protected-group references. Second, in the age of social sharing, most people do not repeat a contested sentence verbatim. They repeat an optimized paraphrase. That paraphrase can change the legal analysis because it changes the target, the attribution, the implied accusation, and sometimes the protected-group hook.

1.1 The Kremlin transcript sentence as the authoritative wording

For purposes of legal analysis, the cleanest "authoritative wording" is the sentence as recorded in the official transcript of the event. That transcript provides a stable reference point for three reasons.

First, it fixes the semantic unit. In ordinary life, people remember "the gist." In law, the unit of evaluation is closer to "the communicated proposition in its public form." An official transcript is not metaphysically perfect, but it is a practical anchor: the same text can be shown to a court, translated consistently, and compared to what someone later reposted.

Second, it fixes the referent. The transcript does not merely attribute a demographic fact in the abstract; it ties the demographic claim to a specific institutional act ("the decision to nationalise this library") and a specific institutional body ("the first Soviet government"), then adds an identity category ("whose composition was 80–85% Jewish"). Whether one reads this as explanation, insinuation, or political framing is a downstream issue. The upstream fact is that the sentence links (a) a state decision, (b) a government body, and (c) a protected identity category.

Third, it fixes the scope of what the speaker publicly "put into circulation." In many legal regimes, liability turns not on private belief but on public dissemination: what was asserted, to whom, and under what circumstances. If later speakers claim, "I'm only quoting," the question becomes: quoting what, exactly? The transcript anchors that question.

So, in this section, the "remark" is treated as the transcript sentence itself, not as a theme, a vibe, or a family of adjacent claims.

1.2 Common paraphrases vs the governing text ("Bolsheviks" vs "first Soviet government")

The most common drift in circulation is the substitution of "Bolsheviks" for "the first Soviet government." That swap seems minor to casual readers, but it is not minor legally or rhetorically, because it changes all three of the following:

First, it changes the category of persons being described.

- "Bolsheviks" is typically heard as a party label or movement label. It can be read as "members/supporters of a political faction," which (in some systems) leans closer to political speech about ideology and party history.
- "The first Soviet government" points to a state executive body or governing cabinet. That leans toward "state responsibility," "institutional power," and "government action."

Second, it changes what the sentence is doing.

- "80% of Bolsheviks were Jews" can function as a sweeping group-to-group claim: it sounds like a demographic characterization of a political movement as a whole.
- "The decision was made by the first Soviet government, whose composition was 80–85% Jewish" is structured as a causal or explanatory linkage: an act is named, then a decision-making body is named, then the body is characterized by an identity category.

That difference matters because many speech restrictions key off whether a statement is functioning as an attribution of culpability or social blame to a protected group. A party-label paraphrase can be read as "movement sociology," while a government-body phrasing can be read as "group-linked state wrongdoing," even before any further commentary is added.

Third, it changes the implied moral vector.

Even without adding adjectives, some word choices carry an implied accusation. "Bolsheviks" already carries heavy historical connotations in many audiences. "Government" carries a different kind of weight: it suggests authority, coercion, and responsibility for state acts. When a protected identity category is attached to that governmental responsibility, some legal systems treat the statement as closer to collective blame, especially if it is deployed in a context where hostility to the protected group is a live social risk.

This is why the paper insists on governing text. If the legal question is "can repeating this trigger criminal speech laws," the relevant item is not what someone on social media summarized. It is what the later speaker actually published or said. If they published the paraphrase, then the paraphrase is the legal object. If they published a direct quotation of the transcript sentence, the transcript sentence is the legal object.

In other words: the “remark” is not a Platonic idea. The “remark” is the text as delivered in the relevant jurisdiction.

1.3 Why precision matters legally: elements attach to what is communicated, not what was “meant”

Across the jurisdictions surveyed later, the recurring pattern is element-based analysis. Courts and prosecutors typically ask questions like these:

- Was the statement public (or distributed beyond private conversation)?
- Does it refer to a protected group (race, religion, ethnicity, nationality, etc.)?
- Does it do something proscribed: incite hatred, stir up hostility, advocate discrimination, assault dignity through group insult/defamation, or encourage violence?
- What is the likelihood or foreseeability of social harm in that setting?
- What can be inferred about intent from wording, context, audience, and surrounding speech?

Each of those questions attaches to what was actually communicated. Precision matters because small textual changes can flip a statutory element from “uncertain” to “arguable.”

A few examples of how that works in practice:

Public meaning is not identical to private intent. Many defendants say, “I didn’t mean it that way.” Some legal systems care about intent; others care about likely effect; most care about both to varying degrees. But even where intent matters, intent is inferred from the communicated text in its context. If the communicated text makes a protected group the salient explanatory variable for a contested historical act, prosecutors can argue that the communication is “about the group” in a legally relevant way, regardless of claimed benign intent.

Protected-group hooks are not triggered by vibes; they are triggered by language. If a statement explicitly uses an identity category (here, “Jewish”), it is immediately eligible for analysis under protected-group provisions in jurisdictions that have them. If a paraphrase removes the identity term, it can fall out of those provisions. If a paraphrase intensifies the identity term (“the Jews” as a collective agent), it can strengthen the hook.

Attribution structure matters. “X people were present” is different from “X people caused Y.” Many speech-law systems draw sharper lines when speech assigns causal responsibility, moral blame, or collective culpability to a protected group. The transcript sentence is not merely “present”; it is chained to a decision and a government body. A paraphrase can make that chain

tighter ("Bolsheviks did X because they were Jews") or looser ("some early officials were Jewish"), and those are different legal objects.

Finally, precision matters because the legal risk in "many countries" is rarely about a single sentence floating in isolation. It is about how the sentence functions inside a communicative act: quotation, endorsement, mockery, insinuation, mobilization, or harassment. When the text is fixed, later sections can do what courts do: map that text, in that use-context, to the statute's elements.

So the methodological rule for the rest of the paper is simple: when we say "Putin's remark," we mean the transcript sentence; when we say "a circulating paraphrase," we treat it as a different text with potentially different legal consequences. That is not pedantry. It is the difference between analyzing an actual prosecutable utterance and analyzing an internet memory of one.

2. What "Can Trigger Criminal Speech Laws" Means

To say a remark "can trigger criminal speech laws" is not to say it is automatically illegal everywhere, or illegal as a free-floating string of words. It means something narrower and more operational: there exist jurisdictions in which repeating that remark in public can plausibly satisfy the elements of one or more criminal offenses—depending on how it is framed, where it is disseminated, and what surrounding context supplies inferences about intent and likely effect.

This section sets the interpretive rules for the rest of the paper. It explains why legal exposure is typically *element-based*, why the *public/private boundary* is often decisive, and why most national systems (despite local differences) cluster around a few recurring "offense families" that organize the analysis.

2.1 No "banned sentence" theory: element-based criminal offenses

A common misunderstanding—especially in online discourse—is the "banned sentence" theory: the idea that some particular phrase is illegal by itself, like a contraband object. That is not how most criminal law works, even in countries with strong speech restrictions. Criminal law is typically structured around *elements* that prosecutors must prove. Speech enters the criminal system not as a wordlist, but as conduct (an utterance, publication, broadcast, or distribution) that is alleged to meet those elements.

At a high level, element-based analysis usually involves four layers:

First, an **act of communication**. The law asks: did the defendant say, publish, distribute, broadcast, display, or otherwise make content available to others in a way the statute covers?

Second, a **protected-group hook** (in the relevant jurisdictions). Many speech offenses are keyed to protected grounds (race, religion, ethnicity, nationality, etc.). The hook is often triggered by explicit group identification, but in some systems it can also be triggered by strong implication if the group is clearly identifiable from context.

Third, a **prohibited function**. The speech must be alleged to do something that the statute forbids—commonly inciting hostility, encouraging discriminatory measures, degrading dignity, or destabilizing public peace. Notice what is being criminalized: not "having an opinion," but allegedly using speech to perform a socially dangerous function directed at a protected group.

Fourth, a **culpability and context package**. Many systems require some blend of intent, recklessness, knowledge, or foreseeability, and nearly all systems incorporate context—audience, setting, tone, surrounding statements, medium, and likely reception. In speech cases, "context" is not a garnish; it is how courts infer what the words communicated, what the speaker likely intended, and what consequences were reasonably predictable.

This element-based structure is why the same sentence can be treated differently across cases. A prosecutor does not typically prove "you uttered the forbidden string." They attempt to prove something like: "you publicly communicated group-targeted content in a manner intended (or likely) to stir hostility or degrade dignity, under circumstances that made social harm foreseeable."

That framework also explains why people arguing about "truth" often talk past the law. Some jurisdictions do provide defenses related to truth, public interest, good faith, academic discourse, or lack of intent; other jurisdictions do not treat truth as dispositive in group-directed hostility offenses. But the key point for this paper is methodological: the question is not 'is the sentence on a blacklist?' The question is 'can the statutory elements be satisfied when the sentence is used in a real communicative act?'

2.2 Public vs private thresholds (publication, meeting, broadcast, online distribution)

In many jurisdictions, the public/private boundary is the hinge that turns a morally ugly remark into a legally cognizable offense—or keeps it outside the criminal category entirely. Even where laws are aggressive, legislatures and courts commonly distinguish between private conversation (even offensive) and public communication that can mobilize or normalize hostility.

There are a few recurring "publicness" thresholds that appear across systems:

Publication and mass distribution. Traditional publication (press, pamphlets, books) and modern equivalents (webpages, posts, uploads) are typically the clearest "public" acts. The law often treats "making available to the public" as sufficient even if the audience is small at first, because the act itself creates open-ended reach.

Public meeting and public place. Some statutes are triggered by speech at a public meeting, rally, demonstration, or in a public place where non-consenting listeners can be exposed. "Public" here is less about crowd size and more about open access and civic visibility.

Broadcast and media. Radio, television, live streams, and interviews have an obvious "publicness" because they are designed for dissemination and carry implied amplification.

Online distribution and "availability." Online speech adds a complication: the speaker may be physically in one jurisdiction while the audience is in another. Many legal systems focus on where the content is accessible, where it is targeted, and where harmful effects (in the law's view) can occur. In practice, online distribution turns jurisdiction into a first-class parameter: a statement that is not criminal where spoken can still create legal exposure if disseminated into a jurisdiction that criminalizes it and asserts reach over distribution to its public.

Private conversation carve-outs. Some statutes explicitly exempt "private conversation" or require that the communication be "public." But the border is porous. A small group chat can become public if forwarded. A "closed" channel can become public if it is large, open-invite, or used as a distribution node. A meeting in a private home can become "public" if open to the public or if the communication is recorded and uploaded.

This matters because "trigger" in this paper is often shorthand for: *the moment the remark crosses a publicness threshold in a restrictive jurisdiction, it becomes eligible for criminal characterization under one of the offense families below.*

So the practical analytic move is always the same: before asking "which statute," ask "what was the mode of communication?" Was it a private remark to one person? A speech at a meeting? A repost to a general audience? A caption under a video? A meme shared into a country whose law treats the act of distribution itself as the relevant conduct?

2.3 Three recurring offense families: incitement, group insult/defamation, public-order/extremism

Although national laws vary, the legal logic usually clusters around three offense families. These families are not mutually exclusive; a single act can be charged under more than one theory depending on the jurisdiction.

Incitement-type offenses (hatred/discrimination/violence).
These laws focus on speech as a tool of mobilization or activation: urging hostility, encouraging discriminatory treatment, calling for exclusionary measures, or provoking violence. The central idea is that group-targeted hostility is not merely "bad opinion," but a precursor to social harm.

Typical features of this family include:

- A focus on **directional effect** ("stirring up," "inciting," "provoking," "promoting" hostility).
- Some requirement of **intent**, or at least knowledge/recklessness, and sometimes a requirement that the hostility be **likely** given the circumstances.
- Heavy dependence on **context**: a historian's lecture, a politician's rally, and a meme campaign can be treated differently because their communicative function differs.

Applied to the remark at issue, the incitement family becomes relevant not because the sentence contains an identity term, but because it can be deployed as an attribution of collective agency that (in some contexts) acts as a rhetorical bridge to "therefore they are to blame," "therefore they are dangerous," or "therefore we must act against them." The statute does not require the bridge to be explicit in every system; sometimes it is inferred from surrounding messaging and predictable audience interpretation.

Group insult / group defamation offenses (dignity and reputation).
These laws focus less on mobilization and more on the dignity or social standing of a protected group. The harm is framed as degradation: humiliating, vilifying, or defaming a group such that the group is treated as contemptible.

Typical features include:

- Less emphasis on calling for action, more emphasis on **demeaning characterization**.
- Legal vocabulary that includes **insult**, **defamation**, **denigration**, **malicious maligning**, or **attacks on dignity**.
- The protected-group hook is often central: the law is explicitly designed to protect groups from public contempt on protected grounds.

In this family, the key question is whether the remark, in context, functions as an accusation that attaches institutional wrongdoing to an identity category in a way that degrades the group's dignity or reputation. The difference between "describing a government body" and "blaming a people" becomes crucial here, and courts often look to how the statement is presented (neutral quotation, insinuating blame, celebratory condemnation, etc.).

Public-order / extremism-type offenses (social peace and state stability).
These laws treat certain group-directed speech as a threat to public order—sometimes framed narrowly (preventing unrest), sometimes broadly (preventing "extremism"). This family is where statutory breadth and enforcement discretion tend to increase.

Typical features include:

- The key harm is framed as **disturbing public peace**, **creating enmity**, **provoking disorder**, or contributing to "extremist" agitation.
- The threshold can be **lower or more discretionary** than in incitement models, depending on the jurisdiction.
- The legal analysis can be strongly shaped by **political context**, enforcement culture, and institutional priorities.

For cross-border analysis, this family matters because it explains why predictability can degrade as you move from "incitement" (often requiring intent/likelihood) to "public order" (sometimes allowing broader inferences and lower thresholds). In such systems, "trigger" may mean simply that the remark is categorized as contributing to hostility or enmity on protected grounds in a public setting, even without explicit calls to action.

Taken together, these three families explain why the paper's thesis is framed carefully as "can trigger." The claim is not that one sentence is universally illegal, or that it is illegal "as such." The claim is that many legal systems have speech offenses whose elements can plausibly be satisfied when this sentence is publicly circulated in certain contexts, while Kansas—operating under the U.S. First Amendment baseline—generally does not criminalize the utterance as such absent additional features (imminent incitement, true threats, targeted harassment, and similar narrow categories).

3. Germany: Incitement to Hatred and Group-Dignity Protection

Germany is one of the clearest examples of a legal system where a sentence can become criminally relevant not because it is "forbidden speech" in the abstract, but because—*as used in public*—it can be treated as (a) incitement against protected groups or (b) an assault on the dignity of protected groups in a way the law regards as threatening public peace. The core statute is Section 130 StGB (often discussed under the label *Volksverhetzung*), and its structure makes Germany especially important for this paper's thesis: the same text can be "legally inert" in some contexts, and legally combustible in others, because the statute is designed to capture both mobilizing speech (incitement) and degrading speech (group-directed maligning/defamation), provided the conduct is suited to disturbing the public peace.

3.1 StGB Section 130 as a public-peace and dignity-protection statute

Section 130 is explicitly written as a public-order provision with a dignity-protection core. In the official English translation, Section 130(1) begins with a threshold condition: the conduct must occur "in a manner suited to causing a disturbance of the public peace" (often paraphrased as "capable of disturbing the public peace").

That framing signals something crucial about German doctrine: the law is not merely policing hurt feelings or abstract offensiveness. It is policing a category of group-directed hostility that Germany treats as a threat to civil peace and equal civic standing—especially in light of historical experience. But the statute does not require an actual riot or concrete violence. The threshold is written as "suited" (or "capable"), which makes it a context-sensitive filter: courts examine setting, audience, medium, and foreseeable effects to decide whether a disturbance-of-peace risk is real enough to bring criminal law into play.

Section 130 also makes clear what counts as a protected target. It covers incitement against (among others) "a national, racial, [or] religious group," "sections of the population," and individuals because of their belonging to such groups. That means that a statement that explicitly invokes a religious identity category (such as "Jewish") is immediately eligible—again, not automatically illegal, but eligible—for analysis under Section 130's protected-group hook.

For this paper's narrow purpose, the key point is structural: Section 130 is built to capture two kinds of harmful group-directed public speech—one oriented toward hostility and action (incitement/calls for measures), and the other oriented toward degradation of dignity (insult/malicious maligning/defamation)—so long as the public-peace condition is satisfied.

3.2 The "incites hatred / calls for measures" pathway vs the "insults/defames segments" pathway

Section 130(1) is commonly understood as having two main "pathways," which are spelled out directly in the statutory text.

Pathway A: incitement / measures.
Section 130(1)(1) covers speech that "incites hatred" against protected groups or "calls for violent or arbitrary measures" against them, again in a manner suited to disturbing public peace.

This pathway is closest to what many English speakers intuitively imagine when they hear "hate speech law": speech that attempts to animate hostility, encourage aggression, or legitimize discriminatory treatment—especially when it escalates toward violence or arbitrary state-like "measures." The statute's wording ("calls for violent or arbitrary measures") matters because it is broader than direct calls to violence: it also reaches speech that advocates coercive,

discriminatory, or extralegal treatment of a protected group, depending on interpretation and context.

Pathway B: dignity assault by insult/maligning/defamation.
Section 130(1)(2) covers speech that "violates the human dignity of others" by "insulting, maliciously maligning or defaming" protected groups (or individuals because of group membership), again in a manner suited to disturbing public peace.

This pathway is distinctive because it does not require an explicit call for action. It is written to criminalize certain public forms of group-degrading vilification when they cross a dignity threshold and create a public-peace risk. The key statutory verbs—"insulting," "maliciously maligning," "defaming"—signal that Germany is willing to treat some group-directed degradation as criminal, not merely civil, under specific conditions.

Finally, Section 130(2) extends liability beyond spoken words to the dissemination of "content" (written materials / media), including making such content available to the public. This matters because modern repetition is often not a live speech act; it is a post, a graphic, a clip, a caption, or a share. Section 130(2) explicitly covers dissemination and public availability of content that incites hatred/calls for measures or attacks dignity by insult/maligning/defamation.

So, in German law, the question is not "Did you say the sentence?" The question is "Did your public communication, in its medium and context, fall into Pathway A or Pathway B, in a manner suited to disturbing the public peace?"

3.3 Why context does the work: when an attribution becomes "malicious maligning" in practice

Section 130 is built to make context do the decisive work. Two people can repeat the same quoted sentence and land in different legal territory because the statute's trigger terms are not purely lexical ("contains X word")—they are functional and contextual ("incites hatred," "calls for measures," "violates human dignity … by maliciously maligning or defaming," and is "suited" to disturbing public peace).

For the dignity pathway in particular, **"maliciously maligning"** is not something that can be read off the text alone. In practice, the maligning character is inferred from the communicative act as a whole: how the sentence is framed, what it is offered as evidence of, what conclusion the audience is being nudged toward, and what surrounding commentary supplies the "so what."

Here are the typical kinds of contextual features that can transform a group-attribution sentence into something a prosecutor might argue is maligning/defamatory under Section 130(1)(2):

- **Attribution as collective blame rather than descriptive claim.** If the sentence is used to assign collective responsibility to a protected group for state wrongdoing ("they did it," "they caused it," "that proves what they are"), it begins to look less like neutral historical description and more like group vilification—especially if it casts the group as inherently dangerous, conspiratorial, or illegitimate participants in public life.
- **Linking language that implies the group is a hostile agent.** Even without an explicit slur, a speaker can frame the attribution so that the group identity becomes the explanatory engine of political harm: "because they were X, they took Y from us," "this is why you can't trust them," and similar insinuation structures. Those structures are exactly where "malicious maligning" arguments typically live: the alleged harm is the public degradation of the group's standing and dignity through insinuated guilt.
- **Audience and medium: amplification in a charged environment.** The statute's "suited to disturbing the public peace" condition forces attention to circumstance. A fringe comment in a tiny private exchange is different from a mass post, a rally chant, or a broadcast segment in an environment where hostility to the group is a real social risk. Section 130(2)'s explicit reference to disseminating or making content publicly available reflects this modern reality: distribution can be the legally salient conduct.
- **Endorsement versus quotation and critical framing.** German analysis often turns on whether a speaker is endorsing a hostile message or reporting it critically for purposes such as news, scholarship, or rebuttal. Section 130 does not say "quotation is always safe" (it is not a magic immunity rule), but it is also not written as "quotation is always guilty." The legal assessment tends to revolve around whether the communication, as received, performs incitement or dignity assault in a way suited to disturbing public peace.

Applied to Putin's remark as a *text*, the German question becomes: in the specific German-public communication at issue, is the remark being used as a rhetorical tool to stigmatize Jews as a group (dignity pathway), or to animate hostility / advocate discriminatory measures (incitement pathway), in a way suited to disturbing public peace? Section 130's design ensures that the answer depends heavily on context rather than on a simplistic "banned sentence" rule.

4. France: Press-Offence Structure and Group-Targeted Provocation

French law is a good example of a system that does not treat the relevant risk as "a forbidden sentence," but as a set of "press offences" (offences of public expression) that can be triggered when speech, in public form, targets a protected group in a legally proscribed way. The governing architecture is the Law of 29 July 1881 on freedom of the press (often called the

"1881 Press Law"), which simultaneously (a) asserts a broad principle of expressive freedom and (b) defines specific "abuses" that are punishable when committed through public means of expression. In modern practice, the 1881 scheme is not confined to journalists; it is routinely applied to public expression more generally, including online dissemination.

4.1 The 1881 Press Law model: speech is "free," but "abuses" are offenses

The conceptual model is: freedom is the baseline, but certain categories of public expression are defined as "abuses" and are prosecuted as specific offences. The 1881 law is written as a catalogue of speech acts that become criminal when made public by enumerated means (classically print and public speech; today, functional equivalents such as online posts are treated as public expression when accessible to the public).

A recurring drafting move in the 1881 law is that liability is tied to communication "by one of the means set out" in another provision (commonly referenced as Article 23). That structure matters for the paper's central thesis because it tells you where the legal switch flips: not at the level of a private thought, and not at the level of a sentence sitting in a notebook, but at the level of public dissemination through recognized channels of public expression (speech, writing, images, media, online availability).

So, when we say the remark "can trigger" French criminal speech law, what we mean is: once the remark is distributed publicly through recognized means, it becomes eligible for analysis under specific offences (provocation/incitement; defamation; insult) when it targets a protected group on protected grounds.

4.2 Article 24-style provocation: incitement to hatred/violence/discrimination on protected grounds

The most direct "trigger" pathway in France for group-directed hostility is the provocation offence: provoking discrimination, hatred, or violence against a person or a group of persons because of protected characteristics (including origin and membership or non-membership in a particular religion, ethnicity, nation, race).

The key legal idea is functional: the offense is about prompting others toward a hostile posture or hostile treatment of the protected target. "Provocation" in this context is not merely "mentioning a group" or "stating a demographic claim." It is communicating in a way that, in context, is alleged to push others toward discrimination, hatred, or violence.

Two features of this provocation model are especially relevant to cross-border repetition of a controversial sentence:

First, the offense is element-based and can be satisfied without an explicit command word like "attack" or "expel." In many systems using provocation/incitement language, courts look at

whether the communication is reasonably read as encouraging hostility or discriminatory posture, even if it is delivered through insinuation, selective framing, or "just asking questions" style rhetoric. The surrounding framing and the communicative function do the work.

Second, the "means" matter. A private remark to a single person may fall into a different category (or be outside the offence), while a post, video caption, broadcast, or speech at a public meeting is precisely the kind of act the law is designed to reach. In online contexts, "public" is often satisfied when the content is accessible to the public (for example, on a public social media post).

So, for this paper's object text, the French provocation question is not "did the sentence contain a religious identifier?" It is: in the particular public communication at issue, was the sentence used as a rhetorical step intended (or plausibly functioning) to provoke discrimination, hatred, or violence against Jews as a protected group?

4.3 Group defamation and group insult concepts as separate hooks

France also offers two distinct "dignitary/reputational" hooks that do not require provocation to action: aggravated forms of defamation and insult directed at a person or a group because of protected characteristics, including religion.

These are separate concepts with different legal grammars:

Defamation (in the 1881 framework) is generally tied to an allegation or imputation of a fact that damages honor or reputation. The key structural point is that defamation is "fact-imputation" oriented. If a speaker attributes specific discrediting conduct, wrongdoing, or moral depravity to a protected group in a way that harms the group's honor or public standing, prosecutors can characterize the communication as group defamation (subject to the statute's elements and defenses).

Insult is generally framed as abusive or contemptuous expression that does not necessarily impute a specific fact in the way defamation does. It is more "degrading-expression" oriented. Where a communication is framed in derisive, contemptuous, or dehumanizing terms aimed at a protected group, it can be pursued as a group insult offense (again, subject to the statutory conditions for public expression and protected-group targeting).

For purposes of this paper, the practical takeaway is that France supplies at least two distinct charging theories for group-directed harm that are not identical to "incitement." One is an action-oriented provocation theory (Article 24 style). The others are dignity/reputation theories (defamation and insult) that can apply even when the speech is not urging immediate hostile conduct.

4.4 The operative question for this text: attribution as provocation vs attribution as defamation/insult

Because this paper holds the text fixed and does not adjudicate its truth, the French analysis turns on how the remark is deployed in a public communication.

The operative French fork is:

Provocation pathway. If the remark is presented in a way that functions as a push toward hostility or discriminatory posture (for example: using the attribution as the premise for a "therefore" conclusion about what should be done to Jews, or as a rallying meme whose predictable effect is to animate hatred), the legal framing tends to pull toward the Article 24 provocation model. Under that model, the sentence is legally relevant not as "history," but as a rhetorical instrument used to incite discrimination/hatred/violence against a protected group.

Defamation/insult pathway. If the remark is used to damage the honor or public standing of Jews as a group by imputing discrediting facts (defamation), or is delivered with contemptuous degradation (insult), the analysis tends to pull toward the defamation/insult provisions. In practice, this depends heavily on what the communication implies beyond the bare demographic attribution: does it function as an accusation of collective wrongdoing, illegitimate capture of the state, conspiratorial agency, or moral corruption? Is it accompanied by degrading characterizations? Is the group treated as contemptible in a way recognizable as reputational/dignitary harm?

This is why, in the French system, it is rarely accurate to say "the sentence is illegal." The sentence is better understood as legally "chargeable material" that becomes risky when embedded in a public communication that satisfies the elements of provocation, group defamation, or group insult. The same quoted sentence can be legally inert in a narrowly framed academic context and legally combustible when deployed as a mobilizing or degrading instrument in public circulation.

5. United Kingdom: “Stirring Up Racial Hatred” Offenses

In the United Kingdom, the most directly relevant “stirring up” framework for race/ethnicity is found in **Part III of the Public Order Act 1986**, which creates a set of offences aimed at acts “intended or likely to stir up racial hatred.” The UK model is important for this paper because it shows (a) a clear, element-based structure; (b) a broad media footprint (spoken words, written material, recordings, broadcasting, possession with a view to distribution); and (c) a proof fork that does not always require proving subjective intent, because “likely to be stirred up” can operate as an alternative route.

A second point matters for the specific text you're studying: UK law defines "racial hatred" by reference to groups defined by "colour, race, nationality (including citizenship) or ethnic or national origins." In UK public-law practice, antisemitic targeting is commonly treated as capable of falling within race/ethnicity protections (alongside religion-based protections in other parts of the Act), which is part of why the same sentence can be analyzed under "racial hatred" tools even when a speaker presents it as "religious" content.

5.1 Public Order Act 1986 Section 18: "threatening, abusive or insulting" words and intent/likelihood

Section 18 is the core "speech-act" offence for racial hatred. Its surface grammar is simple but operationally demanding:

- **Actus reus (what you did):** you "use" words or behaviour, or "display" written material.
- **Qualifying character (what the words/material are):** the words/behaviour/material must be "threatening, abusive or insulting."
- **Hatred element (what the communication does in context):** you are guilty if (a) you **intend** to stir up racial hatred, **or** (b) "having regard to all the circumstances," racial hatred is **likely** to be stirred up by what you did.

A key feature of Section 18 is that the offence is not limited to the stereotypical "public rally" setting. It can be committed in a **public or private place**, with an important dwelling carve-out: if the words/material are used inside a dwelling and are not heard or seen except by persons in that or another dwelling, no offence is committed under Section 18 on that basis. There is also a dwelling-based defence where the accused was inside a dwelling and had no reason to believe the words/material would be heard or seen by a person outside any dwelling.

Section 18 also contains a "no intent shown" safety valve: where the prosecution does not prove intent to stir up racial hatred, the accused is not guilty if they did not intend the words/material to be threatening/abusive/insulting and were not aware that it might be so. In plain terms: Section 18 can run on an "intent" theory or a "likely" theory, but the statute tries to avoid convicting someone who genuinely lacked both intent and awareness that the material could fall into the "threatening/abusive/insulting" category.

For a sentence like Putin's remark, Section 18's design forces the legal analysis away from "is the sentence controversial?" and toward two concrete questions: (1) is the material, in the way it is presented, threatening/abusive/insulting? and (2) is hatred intended or likely to be stirred up, having regard to all circumstances? Without those, Section 18 does not "automatically attach," even if the statement references a protected group.

5.2 The proof structure: intent to stir up hatred vs hatred likely to be stirred up

The UK "stirring up racial hatred" framework is best understood as a two-track proof structure.

Track A: intent-based prosecution.
Here the prosecution aims to prove that the accused **intended** by their words/material to stir up racial hatred. In practice, "intent" is rarely proved by confession; it is inferred from the whole communicative act: phrasing, surrounding commentary, choice of audience, repetition, selective editing, the presence of dog-whistles or explicit slurs, and the pattern of dissemination. Even if the underlying sentence is framed as a "factual claim," surrounding framing can supply the inference that the purpose was to animate hostility.

Track B: likelihood-based prosecution.
This track does not require proving subjective intent to stir up hatred. Instead, it asks whether, "having regard to all the circumstances," racial hatred was likely to be stirred up. "All the circumstances" pulls in context as a first-class variable: the platform, the audience, the moment (for example, heightened community tensions), the presentation format (meme, montage, clipped video), and whether the communication would predictably be received as a hostile group-targeting act rather than an academic description.

Crucially, the "likely" track does **not** turn Section 18 into a "strict liability for offensive ideas." It still requires the threshold that the words/material be "threatening, abusive or insulting," and it is still evaluated through the circumstances filter and the statute's defences. But the structure does mean that someone cannot reliably say "I didn't intend it" as a universal escape hatch—because the prosecution may proceed on likelihood, and the fact-finder may treat dissemination choices as part of the circumstances showing predictable hateful effect.

For this paper's narrow aim ("why it can trigger criminal speech laws"), the UK lesson is: the same quoted sentence can be legally inert in a context that reads as neutral scholarship, and legally chargeable when embedded in a communicative act that the fact-finder can classify as (a) threatening/abusive/insulting in its presentation and (b) intended or likely to stir racial hatred.

5.3 Practical exposure for repetition: quotation, endorsement, and dissemination problems

Most real-world exposure in the UK comes not from original authorship, but from **repetition**—sharing, reposting, captioning, clipping, and remixing. The UK statutory scheme is designed for that reality: Part III includes separate offences for publishing/distributing written material, distributing/showing/playing recordings, broadcasting or including programmes, and possession of racially inflammatory material with a view to distribution. That means "I didn't say it; I just shared it" is not, by itself, a safe posture.

Three practical hazards recur:

Quotation is not a magic category; function and presentation still matter.
A person can "use" words or "display" written material even when quoting. If the quotation is presented in a way that reads as endorsement or as a premise for hostile inference ("therefore you know what 'they' are"), the quote becomes part of a broader communicative act, not an academic footnote. UK analysis is often less concerned with whether the words are technically attributed to someone else and more concerned with what the accused *did* with the words in public circulation.

Endorsement can be conveyed without explicit agreement.
Online, "endorsement" can be communicated by framing cues: selective cropping, adding a headline, adding emojis or insinuating commentary, pairing a quote with charged imagery, or repeatedly deploying the same claim in a pattern that signals a hostile agenda. Under an intent theory, these cues can be used to infer purpose. Under a likelihood theory, they can be used to show predictable impact in a given social context.

Dissemination multiplies legal hooks and creates cross-medium liability.
A text post can resemble "publishing or distributing written material." A screenshot of text can resemble "displaying written material." A reposted clip can resemble "recording" offences. A livestream segment can implicate broadcasting-type provisions. In other words, the same underlying sentence can "trigger" different sections depending on the format in which it is repeated—and the format is often chosen precisely to maximize reach and emotive force, which also tends to maximize legal risk.

Finally, there is a procedural reality that cuts both ways: UK prosecutors have an additional institutional gate for "stirring up hatred" prosecutions (Attorney General consent is commonly required for stirring-up offences). That gate can prevent marginal cases from going forward, but it does not eliminate exposure for charged dissemination campaigns; it simply adds a decision layer above the police/CPS stage.

So, for your specific object text, the UK bottom line is not "the sentence is illegal." The operational claim is narrower: public repetition of the sentence can become chargeable under the UK's "stirring up racial hatred" framework when the way it is presented and disseminated supplies the required elements—especially the "threatening, abusive or insulting" threshold and the intent/likelihood fork.

6. Canada: Hate-Propaganda Crimes and the Public Conversation Line

Canada's Criminal Code draws a sharp line between (a) deeply offensive speech that remains lawful and (b) a narrower class of communications treated as "hate propaganda" and criminalized under specific, element-based offences. For this paper's purpose, the key provision is Criminal Code s. 319, which splits into two main pathways that often get conflated in casual discussion: public incitement of hatred (with a breach-of-the-peace likelihood requirement) and wilful promotion of hatred (outside private conversation). The phrase "can trigger" in the Canadian context means: if a person repeats the remark publicly in a way that satisfies the statutory elements (including the high mens rea thresholds Canada uses), criminal exposure becomes plausible.

6.1 Section 319(1): public incitement of hatred plus breach-of-the-peace likelihood

Section 319(1) targets **public incitement** in a **public place**, and it has a built-in "public order" filter: the incitement must be **likely to lead to a breach of the peace**.

Conceptually, the prosecution has to build the offence in layers:

- **Communication act:** the accused "communicates statements" (which can be spoken, written, posted, broadcast, or otherwise distributed as "statements" in public form).
- **Venue threshold:** it happens in a public place (not merely "somewhere physical," but a place of public access in the ordinary sense).
- **Target hook:** the communication is "against an identifiable group" (a defined category in the Code, typically anchored to characteristics like race, religion, ethnicity, etc.).
- **Functional effect:** the communication "incites hatred" against that identifiable group.
- **Public-order filter:** the incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace.

That last requirement is crucial for understanding why Canada is not operating a "banned sentence" model. The Crown does not just point to a contested sentence and say "illegal." They must connect the communication to a realistic risk of public disorder in the circumstances. Audience, setting, and foreseeable reaction become legally relevant—not as vague handwaving, but because the statute itself demands likelihood of breach of the peace.

In practice, this means Section 319(1) is easiest to apply in circumstances resembling classic public agitation: speeches, rallies, confrontations in public spaces, or public-facing distribution designed to provoke hostility in a volatile setting. Mere quotation, without an inciting function and without the breach-of-peace likelihood, is less naturally aligned with this subsection.

6.2 Section 319(2): wilful promotion of hatred outside private conversation

Section 319(2) is the more frequently discussed provision in modern "online repetition" scenarios because it is not limited to a public place. Instead, it criminalizes communicating statements that wilfully promote hatred against an identifiable group, other than in private conversation.

The elements typically break down like this:

- **Communication act:** the accused communicates statements (again, broad enough to capture modern online posting and sharing).
- **Public/private boundary:** the communication occurs other than in private conversation. This is the "public conversation line" in Canadian criminal hate-propaganda law.
- **Target hook:** it concerns an "identifiable group."
- **Mens rea + function:** the accused wilfully promotes hatred.

Two features matter here.

First, "wilfully" sets a high bar. Canada is not criminalizing mere negligence or careless offensiveness in this provision. The point is purposeful promotion (or, in practical terms, communication where the Crown can prove the accused meant to promote hatred or knew that promoting hatred was the virtually certain or clearly intended consequence of what they were doing). You can think of this as Canada's attempt to avoid a "mere offensiveness" net: the state must prove a strong culpable mental state tied to the promotion of hatred itself.

Second, the private conversation exclusion is doing real work. Section 319(2) is designed for speech that has moved into distributable social space: posts, broadcasts, printed materials, organizational messaging, speeches to groups beyond intimate conversation, and similar contexts. The hard cases in modern life often involve semi-private digital channels: large group chats, open-invite servers, "private" accounts with many followers, forwarded voice notes, and reposted screenshots. The statutory phrase forces courts to decide whether something functioned as private conversation or as public-ish distribution.

Two additional structural realities shape enforcement (even when elements are arguably present):

- **Attorney General consent** is generally required for prosecutions under these hate-propaganda provisions, creating an institutional gate beyond police discretion.
- The Code provides **statutory defenses** (for example, truth as a defense in certain contexts; good-faith religious opinion; public interest with a reasonableness condition;

and communications aimed at pointing out matters for removal with a reasonable belief). This paper is not litigating those defenses, but their existence reinforces the main theme: Canada's model is not "forbidden words," but a defined offence with defined escape hatches.

6.3 How prosecutors map "group agency" narratives into statutory elements

Because this paper keeps the text fixed and does not adjudicate truth, the Canadian question becomes: how could a prosecutor attempt to fit repetition of a group-linked attribution into Section 319's elements, especially under 319(2)'s wilful-promotion pathway?

The mapping usually proceeds in a predictable sequence:

Step 1: Identify the protected-group hook.
If the communication explicitly identifies a protected group (for example, by religion or ethnicity), that supplies the "identifiable group" anchor. The analysis then moves immediately to function and mens rea, because protected-group reference alone is not enough.

Step 2: Characterize the communication as "promoting hatred," not "discussing history."
The Crown's goal is to show that the statement was used as a rhetorical instrument to cultivate detestation, vilification, or hostile group animus. In court terms, they are trying to push the communication into the "hatred" category rather than the "controversial political speech" category. This often depends less on the bare sentence and more on the presentation: captions, surrounding claims, memes, the "therefore" implied by the post, and the pattern of repetition.

Step 3: Prove "wilfulness" from context and conduct.
Because "wilful" is a high bar, prosecutors tend to rely on evidence patterns like: repeated posting after objections; explicit endorsement language; selection of hostile forums; bundling the statement with calls for exclusion or discriminatory measures; or a surrounding narrative that frames the identifiable group as a dangerous collective agent. The underlying claim is: whatever the speaker says they "meant," the communicative act they chose was designed to promote hatred (or was undertaken with knowledge that promoting hatred was its intended consequence).

Step 4: Cross the public/private threshold.
For 319(2), the Crown must show the communication occurred outside private conversation. Public posts are straightforward. Semi-private distribution is where prosecutors focus on functional publicness: number of recipients, openness of access, invitation practices, forwarding behavior, and whether the channel is used as a distribution node rather than an intimate exchange.

Step 5: For 319(1), connect to breach-of-the-peace likelihood.
Where the Crown proceeds under 319(1), they must connect the communication to circumstances where disorder is a likely outcome. This tends to emphasize the immediate setting (public confrontation, rally, volatile event, targeted demonstration) rather than "general online discourse."

So the Canadian "trigger" story is not "Canada bans the sentence." The trigger is: if repetition of the sentence is packaged and disseminated as a group-agency accusation aimed at cultivating hostile animus, and is communicated publicly (or beyond private conversation), Canada's Criminal Code provides element-based routes—especially s. 319(2)—that prosecutors can attempt to satisfy.

7. Russia: Incitement of Hatred/Enmity and Humiliation of Human Dignity

7.1 Criminal Code Article 282: "Incitement" and "Humiliation/Abasement of Dignity" on Protected Grounds

Russia's core criminal-law "hook" for group-targeted speech is Criminal Code Article 282, titled (in common English renderings) *"Incitement of Hatred or Enmity, as well as Humiliation of Human Dignity."* The statute is written in the familiar two-part structure used in many systems: (i) a baseline offense definition keyed to protected grounds and "public" communication, and (ii) aggravated variants that increase exposure when violence, official power, or group coordination is present.

At the definitional level, Article 282 targets "actions aimed at" (a) *exciting/inciting hatred or enmity* and/or (b) *humiliating (demeaning) the dignity* of a person or group, when the targeting is *"on the basis of"* enumerated characteristics (sex, race, nationality, language, origin, attitude to religion, or membership in a social group). The law's triggering architecture is not "a forbidden sentence," but a protected-ground + publicness + aim/effect frame: the legally relevant question becomes whether a communicated attribution is construed as degrading a protected group, or as moving an audience toward hostility against that group.

A key modern drafting feature is that "publicness" is spelled out broadly. The statute expressly treats the public element as satisfied not only by classic public speaking or publication, but also by dissemination "using mass media" or "information-telecommunication networks," including the Internet. That matters because it collapses the distance between "I repeated it" and "I published it": posting, reposting, and distributing can be analyzed as public dissemination even when the speaker frames it as "quotation" or "commentary," depending on context and surrounding cues.

Finally, the current text (as recently amended in 2025) distinguishes a baseline Part 1 pathway from Part 2 aggravators. Part 2 explicitly escalates when the conduct is committed with violence or threat of violence, by a person using official position, or by a group (including organized group forms). In other words, once prosecutors can plausibly attach violence/authority/organization, the case often shifts from "speech + group targeting" to "speech + group targeting + aggravation," with materially higher penalty exposure.

7.2 Public/media dissemination as the trigger condition, plus the 2018 "administrative-first" design

In Russia, the doctrinal line between "private conversation" and "public dissemination" is not just cultural; it is embedded in the elements. Both Article 282 (criminal) and the parallel Administrative Code provision (Article 20.3.1) are keyed to *public* commission, including via mass media and the Internet. So, as with Canada's "outside private conversation" concept (your earlier section 6), Russia's framework treats "publicness" as a gate: without a public element, the statutory match becomes harder (though other statutes may exist for other conduct).

Since late 2018, Russia also built a *two-step enforcement ladder* for many "282-like" fact patterns. Administrative Code Article 20.3.1 covers essentially the same protected-grounds + publicness + incitement/humiliation concept *"if these actions do not contain a criminally punishable act."* That is the legal mechanism by which a first-time episode can be processed administratively (fine / compulsory work / short administrative arrest), while criminal liability under Article 282 becomes more likely when an individual reoffends after administrative punishment (or when the conduct falls into aggravated/violence/organization lanes).

In practice, this "administrative-first" design matters for the paper's thesis because it complicates simplistic claims like "Russia bans X sentence." Instead, the system is set up as: (1) public group-targeting speech is actionable; (2) the state may route it through administrative or criminal tracks depending on prior history and aggravating features; (3) repeat behavior and violence/authority/group organization elevate exposure sharply.

7.3 Enforcement discretion as a legal fact: why text alone does not reliably predict outcomes

Even when statutory elements look clean on paper, Russia is a high-discretion environment in which *enforcement selectivity is itself a legally relevant reality.* That is not a moral judgment; it is a practical description of how "risk" works for speakers. The same definitional language can be applied narrowly (true incitement/hostility cases) or broadly (speech that is framed as "demeaning dignity" or "justifying hostility"), and the state's choices about which cases to pursue shape the de facto boundary of permitted discourse.

Two structural features amplify this. First, Article 282 sits inside a wider "extremism" legal ecosystem in which "extremist motivation" and "extremist" classifications interact with multiple

criminal provisions and administrative processes; that can widen the practical consequences of speech-adjacent prosecutions beyond the immediate charge. Second, real cases often pivot on contextual interpretation: surrounding language, audience cues, platform, timing, and whether the communication reads as endorsement, mobilization, ridicule, or stigma. That means the same "attributional" sentence can move from "historical claim" to "group humiliation" to "incitement" depending on what else is said, how it is delivered, and how experts/police/prosecutors choose to characterize it.

The empirical "shape" of enforcement also fluctuates. For example, public statistics and monitoring summaries show non-trivial year-to-year variation in how often Article 282 is used criminally, while administrative sanctions under related provisions can be far more numerous. This reinforces the paper's key analytic point: in Russia, a speaker cannot infer legal exposure from the bare text alone, because the pathway (administrative vs criminal) and the appetite to prosecute are both contingent.

8. The "Many Countries" Mechanism: EU Baseline Harmonization

8.1 Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA as an EU-wide floor for criminalization of racist/xenophobic expression

When people say "many countries" in the European context, a major practical reason is not coincidence—it is harmonization by design. The EU's Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA was adopted to reduce divergence among Member States by setting a minimum ("floor") of conduct that each Member State must treat as a criminal offense, with at least a minimum level of maximum penalties.

The core floor is in Article 1, which requires Member States to punish intentional conduct that publicly incites to violence or hatred against a group (or a member of a group) defined by reference to race, colour, religion, descent, or national or ethnic origin. The Framework Decision also explicitly treats public dissemination—distribution of tracts, pictures, or other material—as part of the same offense family, making "publication dynamics" a first-class element rather than an afterthought.

It further requires criminalization (again, as intentional conduct) of publicly condoning, denying, or grossly trivialising certain international crimes (ICC crimes; and crimes defined in the Nuremberg/IMT Charter), when that conduct is carried out in a manner likely to incite to violence or hatred against a protected group. That conditional clause matters: the EU floor does not mechanically outlaw "controversial historical claims"; it targets denial/condoning/trivialisation conduct linked to incitement risk.

Two design "release valves" show why this is a *floor* rather than full uniformity. First, Article 1(2) allows Member States to choose to punish only conduct that is either likely to disturb public order or is threatening, abusive, or insulting—a built-in source of national variation in threshold tests. Second, Article 7 expressly says the Framework Decision must not require measures contradicting fundamental principles relating to freedom of expression/press in national constitutional traditions—another controlled source of variation. The floor is common; the perimeter is not identical.

8.2 Why harmonization increases cross-border exposure for a single sentence
Once an EU-wide floor exists, "one sentence" (or one post containing it) can create multi-country exposure for a simple reason: the same basic charging concept exists in many jurisdictions at once.

Three practical mechanisms matter most:

First: the shared offense template.
If Member States are all required to criminalize public incitement to violence/hatred on protected grounds, then a single publicly disseminated message that a prosecutor characterizes as "incitement" is not an exotic theory confined to one legal system. A speaker's risk becomes portable: the same rhetorical move that a prosecutor calls "incitement" in one Member State has a familiar doctrinal slot in others.

Second: the "publication" reality of modern repetition.
The Framework Decision is explicit that public dissemination of materials is covered. In practice, many "repeaters" are not doing live speeches; they are distributing text, screenshots, clips, captions, and posts. Harmonization makes it easier for many states to treat that act as the legally salient conduct.

Third: jurisdiction and the internet problem.
Article 9 pushes Member States to establish jurisdiction when conduct occurs in whole or in part in their territory, and it specifically addresses offenses committed "through an information system," including where the material is hosted in the state's territory (even if the speaker is physically elsewhere). In practical terms: if you post content online, the "where" question can expand quickly—particularly when hosting, platform infrastructure, or accessibility supplies a territorial hook.

For your paper's narrow object—repeating a controversial group-referential attribution—this is the mechanism that makes "many countries" plausible without any claim that the sentence is universally illegal. If the repetition is packaged and received as public incitement against a protected group, EU harmonization means that multiple national codes have a ready-made

pathway to treat the same public act as a prosecutable offense (subject to each country's thresholds, defenses, and enforcement culture).

8.3 National variation: the same floor, different ceilings, defenses, and case-law cultures
Harmonization does not erase national differences; it **reorganizes** them.

Same floor, different ceilings.
Member States can and do go beyond the EU floor—expanding protected categories, lowering or raising thresholds, adding separate offenses (e.g., group insult/defamation frameworks, ideology-specific bans, or broader public-order statutes), and setting different penalty ranges. The Framework Decision explicitly anticipates that national law may extend beyond the baseline in some directions.

Different threshold tests built into the instrument.
Article 1(2)'s option (public-order-likelihood vs "threatening/abusive/insulting") means Member States can legitimately implement the same EU obligation with different "gates." In one system, the key litigation may revolve around public-order disturbance; in another, the key litigation may revolve around whether the communication is "threatening/abusive/insulting" in its form and context.

Different defenses and interpretive cultures.
Even where the statutory language looks similar, what counts as "inciting hatred," what counts as "public," and what counts as a protected-group attack can vary by national case law. Some systems build robust defenses for journalism, scholarship, and public-interest discussion; others rely more heavily on prosecutorial discretion; others treat certain contexts (political agitation, organized propaganda) as aggravating. This is why, even in a harmonized environment, text alone rarely predicts outcomes. The legal system asks what the communication *did* in its context—how it was framed, distributed, and received.

So the EU baseline helps explain the "many countries" claim without collapsing into a "banned sentence" theory. The Framework Decision makes it more likely that multiple European jurisdictions have a criminal-law route available for public group-targeted incitement (and related dissemination conduct). But it also ensures that the real legal question remains what your paper keeps insisting on: elements + context + medium + national implementation—not a magic list of forbidden words.

9. Why Not in Kansas: The U.S. Constitutional Baseline

The core reason the remark is generally not criminal in Kansas is not that Kansas has some special carve-out for controversial history, but that Kansas sits inside the U.S. constitutional regime where there is no general "hate speech" crime. In the United States, the default is that the government may not punish speech simply because it is offensive, biased, or socially corrosive. Criminal liability typically requires the speech to fall into narrow, well-defined exception categories (incitement, true threats, certain harassment, etc.) or to be part of independently unlawful conduct.

This section does not weigh whether the remark is true. It answers a different question: why, as a matter of doctrine, the mere public utterance or reposting of that text is usually protected speech in Kansas, even if it is provocative or inflammatory.

9.1 First Amendment: no general prohibition on offensive group-directed political speech

Under the First Amendment baseline, group-directed political speech is broadly protected, even when it is ugly. The law does not create a general category called "hate speech" that can be criminalized as such. Instead, the state must point to a recognized exception category with a tight doctrinal definition.

That matters for your paper because the European/Canadian models often treat group-targeted vilification or provocation as a standalone offense family (subject to elements). The U.S. model usually does not. In the U.S., the question becomes: does the speech cross into an exception category like incitement or threats? If not, it is ordinarily protected, even if widely condemned.

This is why the Kansas conclusion can be stated cleanly: Kansas cannot criminalize the remark simply because it targets a protected group or because it is socially harmful. Kansas can regulate conduct and can punish certain kinds of speech that meet strict exception tests—but it does not have the general "group hatred" criminal hook that "many countries" do.

9.2 Brandenburg: incitement requires intent + imminence + likelihood

The classic U.S. incitement line is the test from *Brandenburg v. Ohio*. Speech advocating hostility or even violence is not automatically punishable. The state must show a tight triad:

- **Intent:** the speaker intended to incite lawless action, not merely to argue or express views.
- **Imminence:** the lawless action is intended to occur imminently (not at some indefinite future time).
- **Likelihood:** the speech is likely to produce that imminent lawless action in the circumstances.

This matters for "trigger" analysis. Even if a prosecutor believes a remark contributes to a climate of hostility, *Brandenburg* makes that insufficient unless the communication is part of a near-term mobilization toward lawbreaking. A repost of a sentence, without a concrete call to immediate action in a volatile setting, is typically far from the *Brandenburg* line.

So, when the paper says "not in Kansas," it is not claiming "no limits." It is claiming that the incitement route—the route many people intuitively assume—has a very high bar in the U.S., and most "provocative attribution" speech will not satisfy it.

9.3 R.A.V.: viewpoint-selective bans are constitutionally disfavored

Even when a city or state tries to regulate speech by framing it as "harmful group-targeting," U.S. doctrine is highly skeptical of laws that punish speech because of its viewpoint.

R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul is a key case in this space. The Court struck down a local ordinance that effectively singled out certain disfavored viewpoints (for example, symbols likely to arouse anger based on race or religion). The doctrinal lesson is that even within categories of speech that might be regulable in some respects (like "fighting words"), the government generally cannot carve out only certain viewpoints for special punishment.

For your paper's thesis, the implication is straightforward: a Kansas statute that tried to criminalize "statements blaming Jews for Bolshevism" (or any similarly defined viewpoint) would run directly into the constitutional barrier against viewpoint discrimination.

This is one of the reasons the U.S. ends up with a narrow set of speech crimes (threats, harassment, fraud, etc.) rather than a broad "group-hatred" offense family: once government begins selecting which group-targeting viewpoints are punishable, constitutional problems appear quickly.

9.4 Kansas Bill of Rights Section 11: broad liberty with "abuse" handled through narrow doctrines

Kansas adds its own constitutional voice in Section 11 of the Kansas Bill of Rights, which strongly protects liberty of speech and press while also stating that people are responsible for "abuse" of that liberty (classically associated with libel concepts).

In practice, Kansas is not a "speech island" separate from federal law. The First Amendment (through incorporation doctrine) sets the controlling floor and ceiling for most speech regulation. Kansas's own constitution reinforces a broad liberty orientation but channels "abuse" into narrower legal pathways—most notably:

- **Defamation/libel** principles (typically civil, and typically focused on identifiable persons rather than sweeping claims about a group).

- **Criminal-law exceptions** that match recognized First Amendment carve-outs (true threats, harassment, etc.).
- **Conduct regulation** (e.g., trespass, disorderly conduct, stalking) where speech is part of conduct but not punished for its viewpoint as such.

So Section 11 harmonizes with the overall U.S. structure: speech is broadly free; "abuse" is handled through specific, tightly cabined doctrines rather than a general criminal ban on hateful or inflammatory viewpoints.

9.5 The Kansas boundary conditions: true threats, targeted harassment, and related exceptions

To keep the Kansas claim honest and legally operational, the paper needs to specify what *can* be punished even in Kansas, because those are the true "boundary conditions" where the same sentence could become part of an offense.

Common boundary categories include:

- **True threats:** Speech communicating a serious intent to commit unlawful violence against a person or identifiable target. If the remark is paired with threatening language ("we will do X to Jews," "you should kill X," etc.), the legal character changes sharply.
- **Targeted harassment / stalking:** Persistent, targeted communications aimed at a person (or sometimes a specific institution) that meet statutory harassment or stalking definitions. Here, the wrong is not "holding a hateful view" but using communications to menace a target.
- **Intimidation and coercion:** Situations where speech is used as part of coercive conduct (for example, intimidation intended to interfere with someone's lawful activity). Again, the hook is conduct-like coercion, not viewpoint as such.
- **Disorderly conduct / fighting words (narrowly):** The "fighting words" doctrine is extremely limited in modern practice, but the key idea is speech that is a direct, face-to-face provocation likely to produce an immediate violent reaction. Most online repetition of a historical/political claim will not fit this.
- **Defamation (usually civil):** The U.S. generally does not treat group-level political attributions as defamation against a protected group in the way some European "group insult/defamation" regimes do. Defamation law more commonly protects identifiable persons, with major constitutional protections for political speech and public-figure discussion.

- **Bias-motivated crimes (conduct, not speech):** Kansas (like other states) can punish crimes more severely when bias is a motive—*but that is punishment of criminal conduct* (assault, vandalism, threats, etc.), not punishment of speech alone.

So the Kansas conclusion can be stated precisely: the remark, standing alone as public political expression, is generally protected. Kansas liability typically arises only when the remark is embedded in threatening, harassing, coercive, or imminently inciting conduct—categories that are defined independently of whether the underlying viewpoint is hateful.

That doctrinal structure is exactly what makes Kansas (and the U.S. generally) the clean contrast case to "many countries": where other systems often have a direct criminal pathway for public group vilification or provocation, Kansas generally does not—unless the speech crosses these narrow constitutional boundaries.

10. Publication Reality: One Sentence, Many Jurisdictions

This paper has been comparing legal texts. But the real-world problem that makes the comparison urgent is not theoretical—it is publication. In 2025, "speech" is rarely a single moment of sound in a room. It is a set of durable artifacts: screenshots, clipped video, captions, reposts, quote cards, comment threads, newsletters, and indexed archives. The same sentence can be uttered once and then redistributed thousands of times by people who never heard the original remark, into jurisdictions the original speaker never intended to reach. That is what turns a single contested attribution into a cross-border legal object: not the sentence alone, but the sentence *as a portable, replicable publication unit*.

The practical lesson is not "don't speak." It is "treat jurisdiction as a first-class parameter." If your medium is global, your compliance problem is global—even if your body never leaves Kansas.

10.1 Where the audience is can matter as much as where the speaker is

A common intuition is territorial: "I said it here, so only here matters." That intuition is often wrong once speech becomes publication.

In many legal systems, what triggers jurisdiction is not only where the speaker sat, but where the speech act is received, accessed, or takes effect. Online publication scrambles the "where" question in at least three ways:

First, accessibility. If a post is accessible in a country that criminalizes certain public group-targeted expression, the legal system may treat that accessibility as part of the offense's territorial connection. The mechanism varies—some jurisdictions focus on where the harmful

effect occurs, others on where the public can access the content, others on hosting infrastructure—but the practical point is the same: a "global post" is simultaneously "local" to many audiences.

Second, targeting and foreseeable audience. A message can be physically posted from Kansas but aimed at an audience in Berlin, Paris, London, or Toronto—through language choice, tags, community groups, platform targeting, time-of-day scheduling, or simply by posting into a forum dominated by users in that jurisdiction. When prosecutors and courts ask whether it was foreseeable that the content would reach the jurisdiction's public, the speaker's distribution choices become evidence.

Third, republication by others. Even if the original speaker had no cross-border intent, a third party can screenshot and repost the content into a different jurisdiction, where the reposter—not the originator—faces exposure. This is why cross-border risk is not only about "my speech," but about "my artifact becoming someone else's distribution." The sentence becomes a transferable object.

So the paper's "one sentence, many jurisdictions" claim is not rhetorical flourish. It is a plain description of modern distribution: as soon as the remark is made into a publishable unit, it can land in multiple legal regimes at once.

10.2 Criminal exposure vs platform enforcement: separate systems, compounding effects

The cross-border reality is not one system, but two systems that often interact:

System A: criminal law and state enforcement.
This is the domain we have been mapping: statutes, elements, and prosecution thresholds. The key is that criminal liability is (typically) event-specific and element-specific: a given jurisdiction must show protected-group targeting, publicness, incitement or dignity-attack function, and whatever intent/likelihood thresholds apply.

System B: platform governance and private enforcement.
Platforms operate under terms of service, policies on hate speech and harassment, and risk-management obligations. These are not identical to criminal law. A platform may remove speech that is completely legal in Kansas because it violates platform policy or because the platform is trying to reduce legal risk in stricter jurisdictions. Conversely, a platform may leave up content that might be illegal somewhere, for a time, until a report or enforcement action occurs.

The compounding effect comes from asymmetry:

- **Platforms often enforce a "lowest common denominator."** If content creates legal risk in stricter jurisdictions, platforms may remove it globally rather than attempting perfect geo-fencing, especially when moderation costs are high or legal uncertainty is significant.
- **Platform enforcement can function as de facto censorship even where law protects speech.** In Kansas, the First Amendment restricts the state—not private companies. A platform can suppress a post that is constitutionally protected and still be acting lawfully as a private actor. That means "not illegal in Kansas" does not mean "publishable everywhere," even from Kansas.
- **Criminal exposure and platform exposure can reinforce each other.** A takedown can draw attention and provoke escalation. Escalation can create new artifacts (reuploads, mirror sites) that intensify jurisdictional exposure. A legal complaint can lead to platform action. A platform action can lead to legal complaints. The systems are separate but can form a feedback loop.

So, when the paper speaks of "triggering laws," it is also implicitly speaking about "triggering moderation." They are distinct, but in modern distribution they often stack: your legal status can be one thing, your distribution capacity another.

10.3 A practical rule for cross-border speech: map elements before amplifying controversial attributions

Because this paper is deliberately element-based, it can offer a practical rule that is *procedural rather than ideological*.

The rule is: before you amplify a controversial group-attribution sentence, map (i) where it will land, (ii) which offense family could be alleged, and (iii) whether your framing supplies the missing elements.

That mapping can be done quickly in a three-step checklist:

Step 1: Identify the destination jurisdictions.
Not "where am I," but "where is my audience, or where is my post likely to travel?" If you post publicly on a global platform, assume you are publishing into multiple regimes. If you post into a national forum, assume that jurisdiction dominates.

Step 2: Identify the likely offense family in those jurisdictions.
From earlier sections, most exposure routes fall into a small set: incitement/provocation (hate/violence/discrimination), group insult/defamation (dignity/reputation), or public-order/extremism frameworks. You do not need to be a lawyer to do the first pass. You need only

ask: “Is this being presented as a blame move against a protected group?” If yes, those families become plausible.

Step 3: Examine your framing for element-completion.
Many prosecutions do not turn on the bare sentence. They turn on the “therefore” that surrounds it. Your caption, commentary, and context can complete statutory elements:

- If you add a call to action, you move toward incitement/provocation pathways.
- If you present the group as contemptible or morally corrupt as a group, you move toward dignity/defamation/insult pathways.
- If you distribute into volatile contexts or organize dissemination, you strengthen public-order arguments (and, in some systems, aggravators).
- If you quote for critique with clear distancing and analytical purpose, you weaken the inference that your act is incitement or group vilification (though not in a guaranteed way across all systems).

The point is not to prescribe a moral posture; it is to prescribe a publication posture. Once you treat jurisdiction as a parameter and framing as element-completion, “one sentence” stops being a naive object and becomes what it really is: a high-volatility artifact whose legal and distribution consequences depend on where it lands and how it is framed.

That is the modern publication reality behind the thesis: the sentence itself is portable, but the legal interpretation is not—and the speaker’s framing choices are often the bridge between “controversial speech” and “chargeable conduct” in stricter jurisdictions.

11. Conclusion

11.1 Restatement: the text can “trigger” liability abroad but remains broadly protected in Kansas

This paper set out to do something deliberately narrow: hold a single sentence fixed and ask what happens to it when it crosses borders. The sentence is the one preserved in the Kremlin transcript of June 13, 2013, where Vladimir Putin described a state act (“the decision to nationalise this library”), identified the decision-maker (“the first Soviet government”), and attached an identity descriptor (“whose composition was 80–85% Jewish”). The paper did not adjudicate truth. It treated the sentence as a legal object.

Across “many countries,” the reason that sentence can become legally dangerous is not mysticism and not censorship-by-wordlist. It is statutory architecture. In Germany, the sentence can become relevant under a public-peace and dignity-protection model where group-directed

“malicious maligning” or incitement can be criminal when public peace is put at risk. In France, a press-offence system can treat a public use of the sentence as group-targeted provocation (incitement to hatred/discrimination/violence) or as group defamation/insult depending on how it functions in context. In the UK, “stirring up racial hatred” offences turn on whether words/material are threatening/abusive/insulting and whether hatred is intended or likely given the circumstances. In Canada, Criminal Code s. 319 builds a sharp “public conversation” line and requires high mens rea (wilfulness) or breach-of-the-peace likelihood, but still supplies a pathway when the sentence is deployed as hate propaganda rather than discourse. In Russia, Article 282 (and its administrative counterpart) makes public incitement or humiliation on protected grounds legally actionable, while enforcement discretion becomes part of the real risk landscape.

Kansas is the contrast case because it is not operating inside those offense families. Under the U.S. constitutional baseline, there is no general crime of “group-directed hateful speech.” Even deeply offensive political speech is broadly protected unless it crosses narrow lines (true threats, targeted harassment, incitement meeting the *Brandenburg* test, and related exception categories). So, the same sentence that can plausibly be charged abroad—when publicly used in a hostile, mobilizing, or degrading frame—remains, in Kansas, generally protected as political expression standing alone.

11.2 The comparative payoff: fewer myths about “banned words,” more clarity about legal elements

The main payoff of this comparison is epistemic hygiene. Public debate about “hate speech” often collapses into two myths:

- The first myth is that certain sentences are illegal “as such,” like contraband items.
- The second myth is the reverse: that law is irrelevant because “speech is speech,” as if all jurisdictions share the U.S. First Amendment structure.

Both myths are defeated by element-based clarity.

When you look directly at how the statutes are written, you see that most systems are not banning a sentence; they are criminalizing *functions* of public communication—inciting hatred, provoking discrimination, degrading dignity in a way that threatens civil peace, or contributing to public-order/extremism categories. That is why “context does the work.” A sentence can be inert in one use (quoted in analysis, framed as a report) and combustible in another (used as a blame premise, distributed as a propaganda unit, paired with exclusionary conclusions). The law, in these systems, is not a string-matcher; it is an element-mapper.

Conversely, the U.S./Kansas contrast becomes clearer too. The difference is not “America is freer” as a slogan; it is a structural rule: the state must fit speech into a narrow exception

category without viewpoint discrimination. That makes “group vilification as such” hard to criminalize, and it pushes the legal system to punish conduct (threats, harassment, intimidation, violence) rather than punishing the viewpoint itself. Once you understand these architectures, you stop asking “is this sentence illegal?” and start asking “what elements does this publication supply in this jurisdiction?”

That shift—from word-myth to element-clarity—is the paper’s comparative achievement.

11.3 Closing charge: treat jurisdiction as a first-class parameter whenever you quote and distribute

The final charge is practical. In a world where every controversial sentence becomes a screenshot, a caption, and a repost, you are rarely speaking into one legal regime. You are publishing into many.

So treat jurisdiction as a first-class parameter:

- Quote precisely, because paraphrase changes the legal object.
- Identify where the content will land (audience and accessibility matter).
- Identify the likely offense family in those destinations (incitement/provocation, group insult/defamation, public-order/extremism).
- Audit your framing, because framing is often what completes statutory elements.
- Separate legal safety from platform safety, because private enforcement can suppress what Kansas law protects, and legal exposure can arise even when a platform leaves content up.

The point is not to outsource conscience to law, nor to pretend law does not exist. The point is to be jurisdiction-aware and element-aware whenever you distribute high-volatility attributions about protected groups. In the modern publication environment, the sentence does not stay where you said it—and neither do the laws that can be applied to how you used it.

References

1. President of Russia (en.kremlin.ru). “Visiting the Jewish Museum and Tolerance Centre.” June 13, 2013. (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Kremlin
2. Federal Ministry of Justice (Germany); Gesetze im Internet. “German Criminal Code (Strafgesetzbuch, StGB) — English translation (compilation).” (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Gesetze im Internet
3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), SHERLOC Legislation Database. “German Criminal Code — Section 130 (Incitement to hatred) (English text).” (Accessed December 27, 2025.) UNODC
4. United Kingdom. “Public Order Act 1986 — Section 18 (Use of words or behaviour or display of written material).” legislation.gov.uk. (Accessed December 27, 2025.) legislation.gov.uk
5. Canada. “Criminal Code (RSC, 1985, c. C-46) — Section 319 (Public incitement of hatred; Wilful promotion of hatred).” Justice Laws Website, Department of Justice Canada. (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Department of Justice Canada
6. Russian Federation. “The Criminal Code of the Russian Federation — Article 282 (Incitement of Hatred or Enmity, as Well as Abasement of Human Dignity).” Legal Tools (PDF). (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Legal Tools
7. OSCE ODIHR Hate Crime Reporting (HCRW). “Hate crime legislation in the Russian Federation” (summary/excerpts referencing Criminal Code Article 282). (Accessed December 27, 2025.) HCRW
8. Legislationline. “Press Freedom Act of the French Republic (29 July 1881) — Article 24 (incitement/provocation provisions) (summary).” (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Legislationline
9. European Union. “Council Framework Decision 2008/913/JHA of 28 November 2008 on combating certain forms and expressions of racism and xenophobia by means of criminal law.” EUR-Lex. (Accessed December 27, 2025.) EUR-Lex
10. United States. “U.S. Constitution — First Amendment.” Constitution Annotated, Library of Congress / Congress.gov. (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Congress.gov
11. Supreme Court of the United States. *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 395 U.S. 444 (1969). Justia (case text/summary). (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Justia Law

12. Supreme Court of the United States. *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul*, 505 U.S. 377 (1992). Justia (case text/summary). (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Justia Law

13. State of Kansas. “Kansas Constitution, Bill of Rights — § 11. Liberty of press and speech; libel.” Kansas Secretary of State (public text). (Accessed December 27, 2025.) Kansas Secretary of State